

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his review and consideration of the previously submitted amendments and arguments, and for his remarks thereon as provided in the instant Office Action.

#### **35 USC §112**

Claims 1 - 5 are rejected in the instant Office Action under §112, first paragraph. The rejection alleges that the amended subject matter of claim 1 pertaining to “*replacing the cradle with a cradle having a plurality of print engine controllers*” is not found in the specification and therefore is considered new matter.

Applicant refers to the specification at page 14, lines 5 - 25. The specification at this portion describes that in the case of a professional cartridge, it may be required that a special cradle unit be provided that supports the more developed and refined functionality of such a cartridge unit. Lines 22 - 25, with reference to Figs. 32 and 33, go on to describe that the cradle unit for the professional cartridge contains more SoPEC chips than the cradle unit for the starter and intermediate cartridges. Finally, it is describe at lines 25 - 27 that even if a user has purchased a cradle unit which may not initially support a more power cartridge unit, the present system structure makes it easy for the cradle unit to be easily upgraded to support such systems.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above description in the specification supports the amendment of claim 1 pertaining to “*replacing the cradle with a cradle having a plurality of print engine controllers*”.

The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection in light of the above is respectfully requested.

#### **35 USC §103(a)**

Independent claim 1 remains rejected under §103(a) over the combination of Jeong (US 6,672,699), Watrobski et al. (US 2002/0140758), and Morita et al. (US 6,705,715).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of references fails to teach or suggest “*replacing the cradle with a cradle having a plurality of print engine controllers*”. Applicant also notes that the text of the §103(a) rejection does not assert that any of the references teach or suggest such a feature.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom are novel and inventive over the cited combination of references.

Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Applicant looks forward to word of further official communication in due course.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:   

---

Kia Silverbrook  
C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762